DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 408 SO 004 663

AUTHOR	Oppenheim, A. N.
TITLE	Attitudes in Civic Education in Several Countries: Development of Cross-National Scales.
INSTITUTION	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, Hamburg (West Germany).
PUB DATE	May 70
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Affective Tests; Citizen Role; *Citizenship; Citizenship Responsibility; Civic Belief; *Civics; Cognitive Measurement; Comparative Testing; Elementary Grades; Evaluation; Measurement Techniques; *Political Socialization; Public Affairs Education; Social Influences; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper covers the processes of developing an assessment tool to evaluate children's achievement in Civic Education throughout the world. Problems established prior to the study included: 1) uncertainty about a "common core"; 2) the need for special attitude measures as well as knowledge tests; 3) strong out-of-school influences on a child's political socialization; and 4) terminology with political overtones creating difficulties in conceptualization. The development of measures of both the cognitive and the affective domain followed similar stages: A detailed conceptual framework was drawn up, based on content analysis of country documents and pilot interviews; a variety of instruments were designed using different questioning techniques; and the sets of questionnaires were tried, tested, and revised through pilot stages. One major finding showed that political awareness and perception of community develop only gradually in children. Greater unity than expected was revealed among countries toward attitudes and values. Steps of development are discussed, problems with questioning techniques and solutions are examined, and many sets of questions are included to illustrate how final measuring techniques were created. As the result of pre-testing and analysis, a shortened and improved set of questionnaires was finalized for the evaluation set for 1970. (JMB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 068408

IEA/CIV/25

A Report Submitted by
The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement
to
UNESCO

Attitudes in Civic Education in Several Countries: Development of Cross-National Scales

by

A. N. Oppenheim, Ph.D.
London School of Economics

SP 001663

IEA
May, 1970

A. Introduction

The assessment of children's achievement in Civic Education presents a number of basic problems which highlight the differences between Civic Education and other school subjects.

One of these is the fact that Civic Education is not yet well-established as an academic discipline, so that there is a good deal of disparity between countries in the subject-matter covered and the ways in which it is approached. Moreover, these disparities are more influenced by a particular country's political and socio-economic system than is the case, say, with Science or Mathematics. Thus, in a Monarchy children are likely to learn a good deal more about royal succession and duties to the Crown than in a Republic.

Another difference lies in the fact - much stressed both in the curricular objectives and by the teachers themselves - that Civic Education does not merely consist in the transmission of a body of knowledge, but that it aims at inculcating certain common attitudes and values, such as a liberal and democratic outlook, political responsibility, the ideals of tolerance and social justice, respect for authority, and so on. Behind the need to teach pupils certain fundamentals about political, economic and social activities and organizations lies the desire to turn them into effective and responsible citizens of their society. Indeed the cognitive content of the curriculum is frequently used in order to highlight the underlying principles and ideology; thus, information about electoral systems could be utilized to bring out fundamental ideas about equality and majority rule.

One implication of this has been that, as we shall see, the measurement of the children's knowledge (cognitive domain) and the measurement of their attitudes and values (affective domain) has proceeded somewhat separately - partly because children's attitudes in this sphere so often develop well before they have the relevant knowledge, and partly because affective measures need a rather different type of instrument (attitude scales,

projective techniques, and so forth). At a later stage the data obtained through these two sets of measures will be compared and contrasted, and given a theoretical interpretation.

A third difference between Civic Education and other subjects lies in the very considerable influence which out-of-school factors will have on the pupil's knowledge and attitudes. We must expect that the child will be affected not only by what he learns in the classroom, but also by political events and by the entire fabric of the society in which he lives. As far as possible we must, therefore, make an effort to include measures of these among our independent variables.

Finally, we must mention a linguistic and terminological difficulty: in writing about this area, it is difficult to avoid over-simplified labels such as 'patriotism', 'democracy', 'equality of opportunity', 'citizenship' and the like, but we should like it to be clearly understood that such terms are used by us purely for reasons of convenience and not in order to advance any ideological point of view. The labels merely refer to particular curriculum segments or to variables in the conceptual framework; they are defined by their content specifications.

In short, we find that the assessment of achievement in Civic Education cross-nationally is attended by a number of awkward problems: uncertainty about a 'common core', the need for special attitude measures as well as knowledge tests, strong out-of-school influences, terminology with political overtones creating difficulties in conceptualization. We have adressed ourselves as best we could to each of these, as will be shown in the succeeding sections.

B. Contents of the Country Documents

The members of the International Civic Education Committee of I.E.A. which met in Rome in April 1967, had before them a series of documents produced by the national centers of Germany,

Italy, Finland, Iran, Sweden, the UK and the USA. These documents contained a digest, for each country, of the curricular aims and contents in Civic Education for different age groups, of text-books used, and of examination contents. While the country documents differed widely, it was obvious from the start that, in addition to knowledge, all countries laid considerable emphasis on values and attitudes. Here, for instance, is section (1) of article 26 of the constitution of the German State of Bremen:

> "Children should be brought up in a community spirit based on respect for the dignity of all men and on desire for social justice and political responsibility, and should be taught to regard the opinions of others with objectiveness and toleration and work peacefully with other people and nations."

We therefore undertook two detailed content analyses, one dealing with cognitive knowledge, the other with values and other affective variables.

The content analysis of the cognitive domain led in due course to a conceptual framework which has been the major guiding force in the development of cognitive measuring instruments. The analysis of the affective contents of the country documents showed that, perhaps a little unexpectedly, there was a common core of basic values which are stressed in all seven countries concerned. This common core consisted of the political ideology of equality (freedom and civil liberties, tolerance of diversity, majority rule, non-violent conflict resolution, etc.) and citizenship values (such as informed participation, being law-abiding, interest in welfare of fellow citizens, love of country). These values were set out of detail, and were in due course incorporated in the conceptual framework and in the measuring instruments.

For the moment, the development of the tests and questionnaires in the Cognitive and Affective domains is proceeding separately, though there is a continuous exchange of information, of comments, and of criticism. We are not, however, losing sight of the eventual need to arrive at a more integrated picture of the child's political socialization - perceptual, cognitive, and affective. Since this is likely to raise considerable methodological and analytic difficulties, we shall, in due course, need to mount a small, special study to see how our various sets of scores and results can be best brought together

contents in Civic Education for different age groups, of text-books used, and of examination contents. While the country documents differed widely, it was obvious from the start that, in addition to knowledge, all countries laid considerable emphasis on values and attitudes. Here, for instance, is section (1) of article 26 of the constitution of the German State of Bremen:

> "Children should be brought up in a community spirit based on respect for the dignity of all men and on desire for social justice and political responsibility, and should be taught to regard the opinions of others with objectiveness and toleration and work peacefully with other people and nations."

We therefore undertook two detailed content analyses, one dealing with cognitive knowledge, the other with values and other affective variables.

The content analysis of the cognitive domain led in due course to a conceptual framework which has been the major guiding force in the development of cognitive measuring instruments. The analysis of the affective contents of the country documents showed that, perhaps a little unexpectedly, there was a common core of basic values which are stressed in all seven countries concerned. This common core consisted of the political ideology of equality (freedom and civil liberties, tolerance of diversity, majority rule, non-violent conflict resolution, etc.) and citizenship values (such as informed participation, being law-abiding, interest in welfare of fellow citizens, love of country). These values were set out of detail, and were in due course incorporated in the conceptual framework and in the measuring instruments.

For the moment, the development of the tests and questionnaires in the Cognitive and Affective domains is proceeding separately, though there is a continuous exchange of information, of comments, and of criticism. We are not, however, losing sight of the eventual need to arrive at a more integrated picture of the child's political socialization - perceptual, cognitive, and affective. Since this is likely to raise considerable methodological and analytic difficulties, we shall, in due course, need to mount a small, special study to see how our various sets of scores and results can be best brought together.

This special pilot study cannot take place until the various instruments have been much refined and shortened, so as not to overburden

the children. Knowledge and attitudes may develop both separately and together, in ways that are isolated or integrated to varying degrees; we hope that this pilot study will show us how these processes of development in the child can best be assessed and expressed.

C. The affective domain: Pilot work and conceptual framework

As we have seen the analysis of the content of the country documents showed that all the countries concerned emphasized education for citizenship and the broad ideological area of equality, egalitarianism or democratic values. The International Civics Committee agreed therefore -

I. to regard these two sets of values as a potential common core for cross-national assessment;

II. to carry out pilot interviews in schools which would lead to a more detailed conceptual framework and a better understanding of children's developing thought processes in this area;

III. to proceed somewhat separately from the cognitive domain; while recognizing the close interlinking of perception, cognition, values, and behaviour tendencies; this was done purely for reasons of convenience and does not imply a misleading dichotomy.

Subsequently, the pilot interviews took place in the UK, Sweden, Germany and Italy. These were followed by a meeting in Apeldoorn in November 1967, at which a conceptual framework was drawn up and agreed to, and at which a certain amount of item writing took place. Since then, a number of pilot questionnaires have been developed and tried out, in the UK, Germany and the USA. The results of the analysis of these data will be presented in the next section, and has let to fewer and shorter measures with known characteristics in several countries.

The pilot interviews showed very vividly that political awareness and perception of the community develop only gradually. The young child tends to focus on himself and the people he knows, and does not perceive the community as an organized whole, its services, economy, education system, and its many competing interest groups. He trusts adults and does not question why or how things are provided, he lacks a sense of historical development and future progress, and he cannot conceive of adult conflict. His cognitive style is such that he tends to personalize and 'concretize,' i.e. to see political events in familiar personal terms rather than as broad principles or institutions:

if the British government made a mistake, the landlord of the House of Commons would evict them. Everything is seen in simple, stereotyped, good/bad terms at first, with little awareness of finer differentiations or of the possibility of criticism and improvement. Politicians, elections, fellow citizens, his own and other countries are all seen by the child in very simplistic terms; only later does he become aware of broader issues such as individual freedom vs. the rights of others, civil liberties, majority rule, social justice, or the functions of the State.

In addition, therefore, to measure of our two broader areas of concern (citizenship and egalitarianism), we have developed measures which - hopefully - will serve to demonstrate children's growing perceptual awareness of their communities. We, for instance, have asked a number of questions which will allow the child to answer in personal or in community-oriented terms, to show his perception of politicians and of elections, his awareness of historical development, or his feelings of closeness/distance in relation to the national government. Here are some examples:

Q. Why do wars sometimes break out? (one answer: "Because sometimes countries are too greedy" - tendency to personalize).

Q. Why do births, deaths and marriages have to be officially recorded? (one answer: "So that they can know how many births they had, and, if too many, try to control it" - less personalized, more community-oriented).

Q. Why does each person have only one vote in an election? (one answer: "Because if they had more than one vote they would be voting forever" - tendency towards concreteness rather than seeing the abstract principle).

A set of questions asking "How long have we had each of the following in our country?" - intended to show awareness of progress and historical developments. (For instance, about a quarter of a German group of Population II students answered, "We have always had it" in respect of a King or Queen, women working in factories, our political parties, the jury system in courts, advertisements, hospitals and newspapers, while 80% said "We have always had voting for men.")

A set of semantic differential rating scales dealing with the child's perception of (a) his local town council (b) the national government, and (c) his local education authority, covering such aspects as closeness, friendliness, warmth, understanding, efficacy, responsiveness to protest, social justice, power, strictness (and their opposites).

The analysis of pre-tests has proceeded, with a view to improving and shortening these measures, and turning open-ended questions into closed ones.

The above examples will by implication have brought out another important point: that great care is needed in developing measures of values and percepts in children, because these are subtle processes which are easily biased by instruments which are too highly structured or which impose a pre-conceived, adult framework. For this reason, a variety of techniques has been employed: projective, forced-choice, graphic, etc. and many areas have been covered more than once. Thus we hoped in due course to develop the methods which are most suitable for each age-level.

The development of the measures for the two main affective areas (egalitarianism and citizenship) has followed similar stages. First, a detailed conceptual framework was drawn up, based on the content analysis of the country documents and on the pilot interviews; next, a variety of instruments was designed using different techniques (projective questions, attitude statements, check lists, forced choice items), which have been tried out in Germany, the UK and USA: finally, as the result of pre-testing and analysis, a shortened and improved set of questionnaires has been finalized for the 'dry run' in 1970.

The detailed conceptual framework - and hence the measures related to it - dealing with egalitarianism or democratic values covers principles of equality, civil liberties, majority rule, tolerance of diversity, racial equality, etc. Here are some examples of items in this field:

> A set of alleged quotations was offered, asking children if they might give their support to such a person, or not, and why. For example, "I think you should stay out of politics," said Mr. C, "you women have enough to do, looking after the home and bringing up the children." Would you give your support to Mr. C? (One answer: "No. He thinks that women should not vote and everybody over a certain age is allowed to vote and if women want to vote they should be left alone." Acceptance of egalitarian principle).

Another example: "What is the point of giving a good education to boys from poor families?" asked Mr. J, "it will only make them want things they can't ever hope to get." Would you support Mr. J? (One answer: "No. He thinks that boys from poor families should not have an education like rich boys families and I think they should have an education like rich boys families and I think they should all have the same education." -- Acceptance of egalitarian principle).

A set of attitude statements, e.g.

The courts of law should give special treatment to people who are very rich.
Most people can be trusted to use their vote in a sensible way.
Every person should have the same chance as every other person to get ahead in the world.
People of different religions should be allowed to pray in any way they like.

The analysis would show the factor structure of these measures, the degree of inter-correlation between them, and the suitability at different age levels. It is perhaps worth mentioning that in these instruments the emphasis is not on the correctness of the child's knowledge, but on his values and attitudes, on his own developing political ideology.

The conceptual framework regarding citizenship values covered such areas as political participation, willingness to serve the community, obedience to the law, loyalty, the functions of criticism, interest in fellow citizens, interest in other countries, etc. From the pilot interviews we already know that different aspects of the citizen role are stressed to children in different countries, and so we have first of all designed an inventory dealing with the child's percepts of the components and width of the Good Citizen role, in terms of stated ideals. For example, the child is asked to indicate whether any of the following are included in 'what you mean by a good citizen': A good citizen:

obeys the law
is always polite
loves his parents
votes in every election
works hard
has good table manners
minds his own business
is willing to serve on a jury

 and so on (34 items)

We stress once more that we do not score these items for 'correctness,' but for width and emphasis: there may well be a set of 'common core' items, which are heavily stressed in all countries, together with variations in the degree of inclusion of some of the remaining items, from country to country and for children of different ages, intelligence levels, backgrounds, etc. In other words, it is a perceptual technique.

Next, we made several attempts to design a suitable instrument to measure the child's own adherence to citizenship values. There are difficulties here, since the child is not yet old enough to take the role of a citizen, and so we have to ask him what he would do, whom he would support, how he would react, and so forth. This inevitably entails elements of unreality, and we certainly do not assume that the instruments have predictive validity for the child's behaviour as a grown-up; all we can hope to find out is what his attitudes are now, in anticipation of his role of citizen. To this end, we designed several instruments employing different techniques (forced-choice, open-ended questions, attitude statements) but covering much the same ground: voting, and political participation in general; efficacy, the value of criticism; standing up for citizens' rights; interest in national and in foreign affairs; resolution of conflicts; law enforcement; loyalty to country; interest in welfare of fellow citizens; etc. Here are some examples:

> "There are millions of other people who will vote in this election," said Mr. A, "so it does not matter whether I vote, or not." Will you think like Mr. A when you grow up? Yes/No/Don't Know.
>
> Why is that? It is because .....
>
> (Participation: voting in elections. Projective technique).
>
> If there were a general election, would you feel
> (a) that it makes little difference whether you vote or not
>
> OR
>
> (b) that you must vote whenever you can?
>
> (Participation: voting in elections. Forced-choice technique).
>
> Lots of little elections are not important enough to bother about.
>
> So many people vote in a general election that it would not matter whether I voted or not.

It isn't important to vote if your party is certain to lose.

(Participation: voting in elections. Attitude statement).

"If you try hard enough," said Mr. H, "you really can make a change in the way the country is run." Will you think like Mr. H when you grow up? Yes/No/Don't Know.

Why is that? It is because .....

(Efficacy. Projective technique).

If something is wrong, it does not help to complain about it to the authorities.

(Efficacy. Attitude statement).

Our government

pays attention to complaints:	: : : : :	doesn't pay attention to complaints
can have its decisions changed by ordinary people	: : : : :	can only have its decisions changed by powerful people

(Efficacy: Semantic Differential rating technique).

We have also designed a confidence index, in which the child is presented with a number of minor social problem situations (seeing a house on fire, having a noisy neighbor, wanting to meet the local parliamentary representative, borrowing money, getting a marriage licence) which may require him to deal with some aspect of authority or community services; in each case, we not only ask what he would do, but also whether he 'would feel very sure what to do,' 'fairly sure what to do,' or 'uncertain.' As before, we are less concerned with the 'correctness' of the answers than with the child's self-confidence in his ability to operate the system, deal with civil servants, etc.

Attitude research with children is never easy, perhaps least of all when we are dealing with such sensitive areas, and when the results have to be comparable across countries. Comparisons between different age-groups will also be difficult, since attitudinal items suitable to one age-level may not be suitable to the next. Moreover, as we have seen children develop their political percepts and awareness only gradually, and we must avoid the danger of asking questions concerning issues or attitudes which the child has not yet grasped.

The instruments which we are developing will produce not merely quantitative scores to make cross-country comparisons possible and meaningful, but also qualitative scores or profiles which will show differences in the way that children see their communities, at different age-levels in different countries, the different emphasis they place on certain sub-areas and so on. In addition, we hope to relate these results to the politicization determinants, to be able to account for some of these qualitative differences.

All this has required careful analysis - much of it from the typed-out responses as well as from computer output sheets - and, where necessary, further pre-pilot runs on selected instruments. The final set of instruments which emerged is much shorter, and has known statistical characteristics in several countries.

D. Analysis of results:

The questionnaires were next consolidated and produced as a number of separate booklets which were suitably laid out for classroom administration. Great care was taken to provide detailed instructions for lay-out, since children are easily upset by minor problems, such as the lack of lines on which to write responses to open-ended questions. These booklets were sent out to the National Centers in England, Germany and the U.S.A. together with detailed instructions for the classroom teachers and suggestions for translation and (where relevant) adaptation to bring them in line with national institutions (e.g. substitute Congress or Bundestag for 'Parliament').

The First Pilot Stage:

The questionnaires were administered to the following numbers of children:

England	142
Germany	132
U.S.A.	176

Not all children completed every questionnaire booklet; the numbers were about equally divided between Population I and Population II.

At this stage, we were still very much feeling our way. Our first objective was to see whether the children could understand and answer the questions, and to weed out items which were giving difficulties for one reason or another, in particular those that might endanger the cross-national comparability of the ultimate scores. At this stage, therefore, many of the items were given in 'open' form, requiring written replies, and allowance was made for replies such as 'I do not understand this question', so that poorly worded items could be rephrased or eliminated. We were particularly concerned to see whether some of the more difficult-to-measure dimensions would stand up to the necessary crudity of survey techniques.

The analysis of the data took the following forms:

(a) a careful study of the responses to 48 open-ended questions and to 24 projective questions, all dealing with democratic or citizenship values, and with perceptions of political processes; our purpose here was to learn more about the structure of children's attitudes and percepts, and attempts were made to 'close' some of the questions by providing multiple-response categories;

(b) a statistical analysis of response frequencies for every closed item, to eliminate poor discriminators and items open to misunderstandings;

(c) where appropriate, factor analyses were performed, to try to produce relatively pure scales which could be scored on underlying dimensions; these factor-analyses were also helpful in showing the way in which these attitudes actually structure in the child's mind, and whether the dimensions were similar in different countries and at different ages.

In addition, the analysis could show us which of several different techniques might be most appropriate to cover a particular area.

As far as the factor analyses were concerned, it was encouraging to find substantial structural similarity between the results from different countries and age-groups. Thus, a factor analysis of 83 attitude statements all purporting to deal with Democratic Values consistently produced four roughly similar factors, which were tentatively labelled:

Factor I: Racial and religious tolerance.
Factor II: Equality and civil liberties.
Factor III: Power and Authoritarianism.
Factor IV: Elitism (the belief that people at the top know best).

Incidentally, throughout this scale the word 'democratic', which was used in some of the items, attracted the highest numbers of 'I don't really understand' responses; the term was eliminated from all further revisions.

We also obtained a consistent set of four factors from a set of 51 attitude statements dealing with the area of good citizenship. These were tentatively called:

Factor I: Patriotism, national loyalty;
Factor II: Anti-authority, anti-government, opting out;
Factor III: Anti-foreign, ethnocentrism and war;
Factor IV: Social conscience, help to improve society.

It now became possible to select items with the highest loadings on the relevant factors for inclusion in the revised battery.

A careful analysis of the projective questions showed which ones were working in the desired way and which were not, and enabled us to shorten and improve the technique. Throughout the battery, a

great deal of changing, shortening and re-wording took place, and attempts were made to provide 'closed' sets of responses for some of the open-ended items.

The problem of comparability or equivalence was never far from our minds. If a technique worked well with younger children but appeared to be too simple for the older ones, or vice versa, then a dilemma would have to be resolved: either take the risk of using the same technique throughout knowing that the scores might have somewhat different meanings at different age levels (or in different countries); or use different techniques for different populations, as appropriate, losing the opportunity of making accurate comparisons. Likewise, translation is no guarantee of comparability, but what to do if the same instrument were to produce different factors in different countries, or similar factors but loaded on different items?

The Second Pilot Stage:

The now remaining sets of items and techniques, revised and improved in the light of pre-pilot work, were once again consolidated in the form of a number of booklets suitable for classroom administration. During the second half of 1969 these were given to children in the following countries:

	Pop. I	Pop. II	Pop. IV
England	150	113	117
Germany	91	94	103
Finland	---	102	---
Sweden	119	120	96
U.S.A.	119	99	75

The actual analysis of the results had to be based on varying but rather smaller numbers, since not all children completed every booklet, and because in two countries the fieldwork was done in a way which made inter-correlational analysis impossible. Nevertheless an elaborate and time-consuming statistical analysis was carried out, so that the final composition of the scales could be given a sound basis. As a result, over a hundred items could now be dropped.

(1) Political Ideology:

It is pleasing to be able to report that, by and large, it was possible to obtain factorial equivalence across countries. Obviously, the order in which the factors emerged from the rotation process and the specific item loadings were not always the same; sometimes, too, a bipolar factor in one analysis emerged as two separate factors in another. A specific item might hold up well in three countries yet perform less well in a fourth. We also had the problem of fairly small numbers in each age-group within countries so that sometimes there was insufficient stability in the factor picture and two age-groups had to be combined. Table I will illustrate some of these points. It shows the four main factors that emerged from the 47 attitude statements designed to measure democratic values, broken up into sub-scales. It will be seen that, on the whole, the pattern is stronger in Germany and England this is because here the data are based on Populations II plus IV combined, whereas the data for Sweden and the U.S.A. are based on Population II only (often less than a hundred children, after the non-response cases had been omitted). The pattern shows about as much similarity as one can hope for here; in none of the groups was there any tendency for alternative factors to emerge.

TABLE I

Sub-scale A: Tolerance; racial and national equality:	England	Germany	Sweden
1. No matter what a man's color, religion or nationality, if he is qualified for a job, he should get it.	.709	.427	.151
2. Swimming pools should admit people of all races and nationalities to swim together in the same pool	.639	.557	.591
3. Hotels are right in refusing to admit people of certain races or nationalities (R)	-.789	-513	-.537
4. Women should have the same rights as men in every way	.225	.462	.345
5. People of certain races or religions should be kept out of important positions in our country (R)	-.729	-.494	-.677

Sub-scale E: Efficacy	England	Germany	Sweden	U.S.A.
1. If the voters care enough about a problem, they can always make the government pay attention.	.381	.446	.197	.300
2. The government cares a lot about what we all think of any new laws.	.552	.494	-.112	.627
3. Even an ordinary citizen, acting on his own, can have an effect on what the government does.	.432	.379	.163	.641
4. Government decisions are like the weather; there is nothing people can do about them (R)	-.583	-.610	-.787	-.599
5. There are some big powerful men in the government who are running the country and they do not care about the opinions of ordinary people (R)	-.615	-.696	-.587	-.511
6. The government is doing its best to find out what ordinary people want	.538	.554	---	.572
Sub-scale C: Support for Civil Liberties				
1. People should be free to travel where they like in our country, without any form of permit or pass	.332	.274	.122	.036
2. Newspapers and magazines should be allowed to print anything they want except military secrets	.434	.445	.027	.520
3. The government should have the right to ban certain books and films (R)	-.228	-.391	.048	-.258
4. Women should stand for election and take part in the government much the same as men do	.316	.245	.664	.452

Sub-scale C: Support for Civil Liberties	England	Germany	Sweden	U.S.A.
5. People should be allowed to come together whenever and wherever they like	.353	.454	.077	-.010
6. Citizens must always be free to criticize the government	.422	.383	.396	.688
7. People who disagree with the government should be allowed to meet and hold public protests	.379	.234	.383	.370
Sub-scale D: Value of Elections				
1. Everyone should vote, for everyone's vote matters	.201	.086	.176	.417
2. Regular elections in our country are unnecessary (R)	-.384	-.797	-.524	.118
3. Regular elections are very important for the good of the country	.591	.539	.501	.095
4. Every citizen should use his right to vote in elections when he is old enough	.302	.086	.108	-.040

In the same manner, we carried out the requisite number of factor-analyses of the 45 attitude statements dealing with Citizenship Values. We are dealing here not with the growing child's attitudes to political issues but with his attitude to government and authority as such. A somewhat less consistent pattern emerged, which varied in emphasis and clarity from age-group to age-group and between countries. There were two main ingredients:

(a) a factor of political participation, voting, and active good citizenship versus anti-authority attitudes, self-centredness, and dropping out;

(b) nationalism, anti-foreign, authoritarian submission versus pro-foreign, free discussion and political protest.

However, sometimes these two main sets of attitudes were distributed over three, or even four, factors and in some cases mixed with other, more specific, attitudes such as anti-police (part of anti-authority), or eagerness to serve the community (part of political participation). Authoritarian submission (e.g. "The people in power know best") was articulated most consistently. We decided in the end to retain those items which had the highest and most consistent loadings on these two factors, plus a number of further items which discriminated well, and whose characteristics we wished to explore further in the dry run of May, 1970.

Up to this point we had, in line with the contents of the curriculum analyses, developed separate item pools for democratic values and for citizenship values, and these were given to different children. It now became apparent that, whatever the merits of this separation may be in political theory, the two areas show substantial overlap among the children in our pilot samples. From now on, therefore, these two sets of items will be <u>combined</u>, and will be given to the same children in the May dry run, so that we shall probably end up with up to half-a-dozen scales covering this entire spectrum.

The problem of suitability of the same technique for different age-groups is not yet entirely solved. As we have mentioned, certain words or items attracted a high 'I don't really understand' response among the younger children; this difficulty has now been largely overcome by revising or dropping certain items. More serious, and at the same time more interesting, were high response rates for the younger children on 'I have not thought about this before' -- showing how unwise it would have been to force the children's responses into prepared opinion categories. This response shows the developmental process at work; it makes no sense to try to measure a set of attitudes which are as yet unformed. To some extent we can overcome this problem by eliminating certain items and by using only the older children for the processes of scale construction, but we are retaining a 'No opinion' category in all future revisions precisely in order to show the degree of articulation of a given attitude.

It is possible that attitude statements as a technique are unsuitable for the younger children, and that a different technique dealing with the same attitude areas would show a clearer picture. For this reason we have developed two sets of 10 projective items dealing with democratic values and with citizenship values, in the form described in Section B. Here the child is given a sentence of direct speech by a hypothetical person, and the child is asked whether he would think likewise, or support such a person, when he grows up. (For example: "Some newspapers go too far in criticising our government", said Mr. D, "and if I were a judge I'd close them down or send their editors to prison for being disloyal") The child could answer Yes, No, or Can't decide; this makes the instrument readily scorable. In some versions of this technique the child was also asked to explain his response ("Why is that? It is because..."). These explanations showed not only whether the item was understood or not, but also something of the child's political understanding. The above item, for instance, was intended to show awareness of freedom of the press as a basic democratic right. Looking over the responses of some of the ten-year old children of below 100 IQ, we find no awareness of this principle; mostly they say 'No' because "the people need to see what's going on in this country", while some refer to the non-political functions of newspapers, e.g. "If there was a disaster the people who are injured their mothers or fathers won't know if it was their child or not".

Once again there was a substantial 'Can't decide' response in Population I on about half the items and, in addition, some of the explanations offered by the children suggested idiosyncratic attitudes which had little to do with the basic issues of democracy and citizenship. These attitudes are not as yet clearly developed among children of that age. On the other hand, in Populations II and IV the response patterns sometimes tended towards unanimity, possibly reflecting social desirability, and offering poor discrimination. For these populations, correlations between these projective items and the attitude statements ranged from .21 to .49 indicating limited overlap; certainly measures derived from these two different techniques could not be taken as equivalent.

For the moment, we may sum up the situation as follows:

(i) for Populations II and IV we have developed suitable attitude scales which have shown adequate factorial equivalence across countries and between these two populations; this means that score differences can be used to show that one group of children is more tolerant, more nationalistic, etc. than another group;

(ii) for Population I it will be possible to show on these same scales that their attitudes are less clear or less formed than those of older children;

(iii) the projective items can, in closed form, be used to show much the same difference in articulation or development between Population I and Population II (the items are hardly suitable for Population IV); in addition, in open-ended form, where the child is asked to explain his responses, this technique can throw a good deal of light on the child's developing political awareness -- but it makes the technique more time-consuming, and more laborious to process;

(iv) since the May dry run will only include Population II children, the projective items have been left out of the battery; however, we retain the option of using this technique with Population I in open form (to show attitudinal development) and with Population II in closed form (for comparison) -- in addition to the scaled attitude statements.

We have developed one further technique to measure citizenship values. This is a forced-choice approach; for example:

"What would you do if there were a lot of people out of work in your community? Would you

(a) feel sorry for them but leave them to solve their own problems? OR (b) try to do something to find them jobs or money?

(tick one)

21

This relatively crude technique has produced surprisingly good discrimination, and for the May dry run, is being retained in the battery since it works well with the younger children and correlates about .40 with the projective items.

We also have a short set of items dealing specifically with the child's attitude to equality or egalitarianism:

There are lots of different people in our country. Do you think they should all have the same rights and freedoms as everyone else or should they be treated differently? Please put a tick (✓) for every group to show how you think they should be treated.

They should have:	More rights and freedoms than everyone else	Exactly the same as everyone else	Fewer rights and freedoms than everyone else	I don't know
1. Lawyers.....				
2. Religious leaders.....				
3. Discharged prisoners.....				
4. Colored people.....				
5. Artists.....				
6. Communists.....				
7. Factory workers.....				
8. Leaders of big business corporations.....				
9. Military leaders.....				
10. Tramps.....				
11. People with anti-(mother country) views.....				
12. Doctors.....				

These items also work well with younger children, and provide a Don't Know score as well as an egalitarianism score. The May dry run will show how well it correlates with the attitude scales.

(2) Perception of Political Processes:

It will be recalled that the early pilot interviews had shown that younger children have but a limited awareness of political institutions, of conflicts between interest groups, of historical development, and so on. They tend to be in an earlier stage of

cognitive development, so that they see everything in highly personal and concrete terms and find it difficult to use abstractions. The conceptual framework called for the measurement of a number of these percepts, most of which were approached in the first stage of the pilot work by means of open-ended questions; in the second stage, the more successful ones were retained, and some of these have now been turned into multiple-choice, scorable items for the May dry run.

To measure the child's perception of adult conflict a set of items has been developed, for example:

How united are we?

Do all grown-ups generally agree about what our government should do or do they sometimes disagree? Below you will find different groups of people in each question; please tell us how well you think they agree with each other about what the government should do, by putting a tick (✓) in the right column. At the top of the columns you will find the following headings:

Mostly agree
Agree about half of the time
Disagree most of the time
I don't know

about what the government should do

	Mostly agree	Agree about half of the time	Disagree most of the time	I don't know
	about what the government should do			
1. Men and women.....				
2. Business leaders and trade union leaders...				
3. The newspapers and the people in parliament..				
4. Middle class people and working class people.....				
5. Older people and younger people.....				
6. People of different religions.....				
7. Husbands and their wives.....				
8. Well-to-do-people and poor people.....				
9. Different political parties.....				
10. Radio or TV commentators and the people in parliament.....				

These items have now been piloted several times, and appear to offer good discrimination as well as a 'Don't Know' score. A child who sees adults as all-powerful, wise, and united will not realize the need for institutions that help to resolve conflicting interests or ideologies.

We took some trouble to develop an index of the child's awareness of progress and historical change, but this instrument did not do well in the early pilot work and has now been omitted.

We developed a set of items which we intended to constitute a confidence index, to show the child's feelings of relatedness to social institutions and his confidence in being able to call upon them for his own needs, now or in the future. These items went through a number of revisions and were originally given in 'open' form.

What would you do?

How sure do you feel that you would know what to do in each of the following situations? Read each question, and then please put a tick in one of the four columns provided to show how sure you feel that you would know what to do.

	I WOULD FEEL			
	Very sure what to do	Fairly sure what to do	Uncer-tain	Go away do nothing
1. What would you do if you were the first to see a building on fire?				
2. What would you do if you wanted to study to become a doctor?				
3. What would you do if you found someone lying unconscious on the pavement?				
4. What would you do if you saw some men fighting in the street?				
5. What would you do if, later on, you found your working condition dirty or dangerous, but there were no other jobs in the area?				
6. What would you do if, later on, you wanted to be paid more money for your work?				
7. What would you do if you disagreed strongly with something written in a newspaper?				

And so on to item 12.

As they now stand, half the items refer to the child's future status as an adult and half to situations he might encounter now; they yield a 'confidence' or a readiness-to-call-upon-institutions score and also an alienation score (Go away, do nothing).

We have also developed a perception of good citizenship scale, to show how childrer perceive the citizen role. (This must be considered separately from the items dealing with citizenship values, though the two scales in fact show a modest inter-correlation, suggesting that the development of attitudes and percepts goes hand in hand.)

How do children perceive the citizen role? What, in their view, is included or excluded (in different countries)? What does the term 'good citizen' mean to them? And does this perception show a link with Civic Education in schools and in the community? From our factor-analyses we have tentatively identified three factors:

Factor I: Active Citizenship

> "Imagine that you had to explain what a good citizen is, or what a good citizen ought to do. Please read each sentence, then put a tick (✓) under the heading 'Good Citizen' if that is what you mean by a good citizen. If the sentence does NOT help to explain what you mean by a good citizen, put a tick under 'No'. If you are not sure, put a tick under the question-mark'?'.
>
> A GOOD CITIZEN
>
> (1) Joins a political party
> (2) Knows a good deal about how our tax money is spent
> (3) Tries to change things in the government
> (4) Gets other people to vote in elections
> (5) Belongs to a Trade Union

This Factor seems to highlight the active, pressure-group type of a citizen role.

Factor II: Disengaged Citizenship

(1) Obeys the law
(2) Votes in every election
(3) Pays his taxes regularly
(4) Keeps up with what is happening in the world
(5) Stands up when the National Anthem is played in public

This Factor seems to describe the loyal, interested but disengaged citizen role.

Factor III: Non-political Aspects

(1) Is always polite
(2) Is loyal to his family
(3) Works hard
(4) Has good table manners
(5) Shows respect for a funeral
(6) Studies hard to pass an examination.

From the reports submitted by different civic education committees we have seen that some of these aspects are sometimes stressed as part of the civic education process; this Factor is therefore likely to produce interesting between-country differences. For instance, about one-quarter of the German pilot sample endorsed 'Has good table manners'.

Thus we expect that each child will have three scores on Percept of Good Citizenship, and that these scores will be related to the independent as well as the dependent variables.

Two sets of semantic differential-type rating scales have been developed, to show the child's perception of his local and his national government. Each item is of interest in itself, and shows how children differentiate between the national and the local levels; for instance, in some of the pilot samples the children seemed to perceive the national government as 'closer', and the local government as more 'distant', on several items. The factor-analyses showed adequate to good congruence across countries: generally, the younger

children (Population I) tended to show poor structure (indicating unclear percepts) or else the whole instrument was swamped by a General Evaluation (Good/Bad) factor; among the older children, two clear factors emerged at first: General Evaluation, and Perception of Power; further analysis showed a Responsiveness factor (its opposites being distant, hard to influence):

Factor I: General Evaluation (Good/Bad):

Friendly	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Unfriendly
Warm-hearted	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Cold-hearted
Popular	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Unpopular
Foolish	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Sensible
Can be trusted	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	CanNOT be trusted

Factor II: Perception of Power:

Weak	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Strong
Rich	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Poor
Strict	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Easy-going
Gets things done	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Often doesn't get things done

Factor III: Responsiveness:

Cares about me and my family	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Doesn't care about me and my family
Does things for selfish reasons	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Does things for the good of the whole area
Pays attention to complaints	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Doesn't pay attention to complaints
Can have their decisions changed by ordinary people	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Can only have their decisions changed by powerful people
Run by a few big, powerful groups	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	Run by people just like ourselves

We now come to the analysis of the 48 open-ended questions. It will be recalled that these were designed to explore some of the subtler aspects of the child's developing percepts of political phenomena, such as his awareness of the community and of adult conflict, his tendency to personalize, his limited ability to cope with abstract ideas, his perception of social causality, of politicians, of his own country and its traditions and values, and of people in general (cynicism, trustworthiness, etc.).

The yield from these items was very rich, and has thrown a vivid light on the children's ways of thinking. Here are some miscellaneous illustrative examples:

Question: What are some of the things that make you proud of our country?

A. The traditions and songs, going to church.
The thing I am proud of is that we rule lots of countries and that we don't fight wars.
That England beat Germany in the War.
That we discover things that no country in the world has got.
TV phone.
Our Queen and celebrations.
The nice fruits and the summer and my chickens.
That we were the first citizens to land in America.
That we are free, not slaves. We can eat, not starve.
My country is Italy and I am proud of it because it is beautiful and it is Roman Catholic.
The crown jewels.
I think that everybody gets enough money to live and that we do not treat colored people wrongly in the USA.

Question: What are some of the things that make you proud of our country?

A. Ich bin nicht stolz auf mein Land. Ich finde es idiotisch, denn ich bin darauf stolz, was ich mit eigenen Händen geschaffen habe.
Ich bin nicht stolz auf Deutschland.
Auf nichts.
Ich bin auf das Land, in dem ich zufällig lebe, nicht mehr stolz als auf andere Länder auch.
Dass wir 1966 ins Endspiel bei der Fussballweltmeisterschaft kamen, sonst bin ich nicht stolz auf mein Land.
Weil sich Deutschland trotz der Zerstörung im Zweiten Weltkrieg wieder zu einem der reichsten und bedeutendsten Ländern emporgearbeitet hat.
Weil es grosse Männer (Adenauer, Goethe, Mozart) hervorgebracht hat.
Weil es eine grosse Sportnation ist und weil Frankfurt in Deutschland liegt.
Der deutsche Staat, die Regierung, die Bundeswehr, der deutsche Soldat, Deutschlands Vergangenheit, Teufel und Dutschke.

Weil es mein Vaterland ist.
Ich bin nicht auf die Vergangenheit stolz. In der Gegenwart bin ich stolz, dass Erhard unser Land zum zweitgrössten Industriestaat gemacht hat.
Weil es sich nach dem totalen Zusammenbruch wieder aufgerichtet hat.
Ich bin nicht auf Deutschland stolz. Ich finde, es ist das schlechteste Land auf der Erde. Erstens: wegen Hitler, zweitens: wegen der jetzigen Politik, drittens: wegen der Sprache.
Es hat nach dem Kriege nicht den Kopf verloren.
Ich habe keinen Grund, auf mein Land stolz zu sein.
Nein, ich bin nur teilweise stolz, da es zu wenig Jugendhäuser gibt.
Sonst finde ich Deutschland sehr gut.
Unser Land hat eine gute Tradition, auf die man stolz sein kann.
Wieso soll ich stolz sein? Ich lebe in Deutschland, das ist alles.
Vaterland, Demokratie, Meinungsfreiheit.
Ich finde gut, dass unser Land Entwicklungshilfe spendet und auch Israel eine Vergütung für die Judenmorde gibt.
Ich bin hier geboren und hänge an meinem Heimatland und würde es nie tauschen.

Question: And what are some of the things that are not so good in our country?

A. The flower people.
Some people throw litter around and are never happy, always moaning.
The dirt on the streets, and the weather, and the burglars, and the smoke.
We are being pushed out by colored people. I don't mind a Jew, but I think that we have got too much of them.
I do not think there is one thing wrong with my country.
Some people don't care about anything and they think that as long as they are okay then everything is just fine.
There are lots of murders and criminals.
The hunting and killing of wild life; we destroy the countryside in which they live to make room for all the foreigners that come into our country.
Everything is good in my country.
Untidy country, bad citizens and a bad government.

Question: Why do some countries have kings or queens while other countries have presidents?

A. It is because the kings and queens do not have children and then themselves die, and they have to have presidents.
Because some country didn't have Royal blood when it was discovered.
Because some countries are democratic countries.
Some countries are independent and some aren't.
Because some countries are greater.
Some countries have presidents because they have no royal family.
Some countries can't afford to have kings and queens and some don't believe in it.
Some countries get bored with the same people ruling over them and so they think it is better to change them.

Question: Why do all births, deaths and marriages have to be officially recorded?

A. It is something you are very happy about and something you are very sad about.
We must know how many people die, have married and have just been born.
If anyone wanted to know when someone was born or dies they just need to look it up.
To have proof of it for the will.
So that no-one can pretend they are someone else or say they have been married when they aren't.
So that the government can tell how many people have been born, married or have died.
So that the mother cannot change the baby's name.
If they were not, you would not receive your birth and death certificates.

countries have presidents.

A. It is because the kings and queens do not have children and then themselves die, and they have to have presidents.
Because some country didn't have Royal blood when it was discovered.
Because some countries are democratic countries.
Some countries are independent and some aren't.
Because some countries are greater.
Some countries have presidents because they have no royal family.
Some countries can't afford to have kings and queens and some don't believe in it.
Some countries get bored with the same people ruling over them and so they think it is better to change them.

Question: Why do all births, deaths and marriages have to be officially recorded?

A. It is something you are very happy about and something you are very sad about.
We must know how many people die, have married and have just been born.
If anyone wanted to know when someone was born or dies they just need to look it up.
To have proof of it for the will.
So that no-one can pretend they are someone else or say they have been married when they aren't.
So that the government can tell how many people have been born, married or have died.
So that the mother cannot change the baby's name.
If they were not, you would not receive your birth and death certificates.

Question: Why do policemen wear a uniform?

A. Because if anyone is in trouble in a crowd they would see him ahead and be able to recognise him.
So that if there was a robbery and a policeman was chasing the thief you could tell which was the policeman.
So that if you were in need of some help you could soon spot a policeman on the street.
To look smart.
So that if somebody is lost they only have to look for a blue uniform.
To show that they are police and so that people cannot imitate them.
For people so that they know not to do wrong.
So we know they're coming, to stop people getting into trouble.

Question: Why do policemen wear a uniform?

A. Weil sie dadurch besser im Strassenverkehr erkannt werden.
Manche Leute haben vor Uniformen mehr Achtung.
Weil sie Beamte des Staates sind und für Ordnung sorgen, deshalb muss man sie gut erkennen können.
Weil die Deutschen Uniformen lieben. Es ist bald so, dass die Uniform den Polizisten macht.
Weil sie damit berechtigt sind, jemanden zu bestrafen.
Weil sie Respektspersonen sein sollen.
Damit sie eine einheitliche Kleidung haben.
Weil sonst jeder kommen und Polizist spielen könnte.
Damit ihnen bei Demonstrationen nicht die eigenen Kleider zerrissen werden.
Damit man sie besser erkennt, Geheimpolizisten tragen deshalb Zivil.
Es ist eine Berufskleidung wie beim Maurer der Arbeitsanzug.
Sie können sich dann besser durchsetzen.
Die Uniform verleiht ihnen einen würdevollen Ausdruck.
Damit sie sich bei Demonstrationen untereinander erkennen.
Es heisst: die Polizei, Dein Freund und Helfer. Wie soll man seinen Helfer erkennen, wenn er nicht irgendwie gekennzeichnet ist?
Leute, die Hilfe brauchen, sollen den Polizisten schon von weitem erkennen.
Weil man an der Uniform ihren Beruf erkennen soll, sie müssten sonst immer ihren Ausweis zeigen.
Es ist unnötig, aber es ist eine alte Tradition.
Weil viele Beamte Uniform tragen, z.B. Post und Bundesbahn.
Sie sind etwas ähnliches wie Soldaten, Staatsdiener.

Question: What happens if a large newspaper publishes criticisms of the government?

A. Es kommt zu einem Skandal.
Die Zeitung wird mit Kritiken überschüttet.
Die Zeitung wird von der Regierung angezeigt.
Sie geht bankrott.
Der Reporter wird bestraft.
Die Regierung wehrt sich, die Zeitung wird abgeschafft.
Die Regierung kann nichts tun, weil die Leute sie nicht wollen.
Die Zeitung muss den Schaden bezahlen, den sie dadurch angerichtet hat.
Es gibt Proteste für und gegen die Zeitung.
Demontrationen.
Die Zeitung darft nich mehr gedruckt werden, sonst würde das Volk nicht diese Partei wählen.
Es kommt zu einer Gerichtsverhandlung.
Es kommt zu Streit im Bundestag.
Die Zeitung muss so lange verboten bleiben, bis sie so etwas nicht mehr schreibt.

Question: Why does each country have its own flag?

A. Because if they all had the same flag you wouldn't know one country from another.
Because it wants its own thing.
Because if there was a war they would know what country it is by its own flag.
Because it goes up on the king's or queen's palace.
Because if we didn't have a flag, you wouldn't know which side you were on.
Countries have their own flag to know that it is a country and it is like a country's sign.
Each country has its own flag because of war, so they won't hit one of their own ships.
When ships are coming, to know which country they come from.
To show that no other country rules it.

The usual way in which responses of this kind are quantified is by means of a coding frame. A coding frame is a set of categories into which the responses are classified; it can be developed to show the major sub-groups of responses (based on frequency), or to test certain hypotheses or expectations, or to highlight differences between groups of respondents, e.g. older and younger, English and German children. Thus, the responses to the pride-of-the-country question could be classified as concrete or abstract; or we could use headings such as "achievements", "famous sons", "social climate", etc.; or, to bring out the English-German differences, we could employ a heading such as "denial: Not proud of country". The responses to the police uniform question could be classified to show the underlying attitude to the police as helpful/authoritarian, and so on. In a sense, since many of the questions were deliberately projective, it is possible to design coding frames at several levels. Here, for instance, is a set of German responses to the civil records question; the letters S or P indicate that the response could be classified as Socio-centric (showing awareness of the needs of the community) or Personalised.

Question: Why do all births, deaths and marriages have to be officially recorded?

A. S Weil man sonst nicht weiss, wieviele Menschen in einem Land wohnen.
P Weil man auf diese Weise manchmal herausbekommt, wie ein Dieb heisst.
P Damit nicht jemand zwei Frauen bzw. zwei Männer hat.
S Damit man eine Übersicht behält.
S Man wüsste nicht, wieviele Bürger ein Staat hätte und das in einem grossen Volke.
P Man muss feststellen können, wer der Täter oder der Schuldiger ist.
P Damit sich niemand einen anderen Namen geben kann.
P Damit sich von jeden das Alter und den Namen weiss.
S Damit es für die Nachwelt erhalten bleibt.
P Weilso der Stammbaum entstehen kann.
S Weil man sonst keine Kontrolle über das Land hat.
S Damit man sehen kann, ob die Bevölkerung wächt.
P Damit man Kinder, die sich verlaufen, zurückbringen kann.
S Wegen der Wohnungssuche.

S = Socio-centric
P = Personalised

Obviously, certain minimum standards of reliability would have to be met. The coding frame would have to be capable of unambiguous application, and for each dimension (e.g. ethnocentrism) we would require a number of items or questions; to give a child any kind of score or classification on the basis of a single projective response might not be sufficiently reliable, especially since these responses deal with ideas and feelings which could easily be influenced.

To what extent can these questions be used in the major fieldwork stage? The pre-testing and pilot work would readily enable us to select sets of questions appropriate to chosen dimensions or areas of interest, and to suggest the outlines of relevant coding frames. However, the coding operation itself is laborious, time-consuming and expensive, while the task of producing written answers to perhaps two dozen questions would be highly demanding of testing time, especially in Population I. For these reasons, open-ended questions have been regrettably excluded from the final battery.

However, we have started to experiment with the possibility of developing a multiple-response answering technique for some of these items. In the case of projective questions such as these, the risk is that we might be putting ideas into the children's minds, which would invalidate the responses. The assumption is that children will, in a multiple choice situation, consistently select those types of responses which they would have given as free responses -- an assumption which is difficult to test. On the other hand, there is the probability that children will not realise the underlying intent of the items and therefore, in the end, choose the responses which they genuinely prefer.

We decided to concentrate on two attributes or dimensions of the child's thought-processes; ego-centric vs. socio-centric thinking, and concrete vs. abstract.

	Concrete	Abstract
Ego-centric	Personalised	—
Socio-centric		

Putting them into juxtaposition, two further points emerged: first, a child who thinks in ego-centric and concrete ways is, in fact, personalising his percepts, in ways that we have noted before: second, we found no abstract ego-centric responses. This left us with three types of answer categories. We then chose the questions (items 53-58 in the Appendix) which best reflected these aspects in the pilot work, and selected 2 answers of each type, for the most part from the children's own responses, making six answer-categories in all.

An example may clarify the scoring process. Let us again take the question Why do all births, deaths and marriages have to be officially recorded?

(a) To make it easier to find people who have disappeared
(b) So that you can prove who you are, or prove that you are married, or not
(c) So that the government will know how many people have been born, married or have died
(d) So that you could not pretend to be someone else
(e) So that plans can be made for the number of houses and schools that will be needed
(f) So that everyone will pay the correct amount of income tax
(g) I don't know

A child who chooses answers (b) or (d) is thinking chiefly of himself (ego-centric), or of someone with whom he could identify, and he visualises a highly concrete and personalised situation. If he chooses responses (c) or (e) then he is thinking of abstract problems such as planning, and he is not thinking of himself but of the community as a whole (socio-centric). A child who chooses one of the responses (a) or (f) is aware of the community (socio-centric), but only in a relatively concrete way. By scoring and summing the child's responses over the six items we hope to show the stage which his cognitive development has reached, and this in turn will help to explain his socio-political attitudes and percepts, his ability to grasp the purposes of principles and institutions, and his understanding of his own society.

APPENDIX

WHEN YOU GROW UP

When you grow up, what sort of a person do you want to become? In each question that follows, we give you something that a different person has said. Then we ask you whether you would want to be like such a person or not. Of course, you would really need to know a lot more about each of these people before you could decide; on the other hand, you can sometimes tell quite a lot about a person from the way he talks.

Here is the first question:

---

1. "I think women should stay out of politics," said Mrs. A., "anything to do with politics is for men to decide."

Will you think like Mrs. A. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

2. "I will sell my house to a colored family if I want to," said Mr. B.

Will you think like Mr. B. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

3. "Of course people with different religions teach their children different ideas," said Mr. C., "but if that is what they want to do, then I think we should leave them alone."

Will you think like Mr. C. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

4. "It's better to read more than one newspaper," said Mr. D. "that way you get different points of view about public affairs."

Will you think like Mr. D. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

5. "We should always speak up when we disagree with the government," said Mrs. E., "that way we get better laws in the end."

Will you think like Mrs. E. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

6. "We must give you a chance to say what you think," said Mr. F. "even if we don't agree with you."

Will you think like Mr. F. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

7. "What's the good of complaining," said Miss G., "the Government won't listen to people like me anyway."

Will you think like Miss G. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

8. "If you try hard enough," said Mr. H., "you really <u>can</u> make a change in the way the country is run."

Will you think like Mr. H. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

9. "Some newspapers go too far in blaming our government," said Mr. J., and if I were a judge I'd close them down for being disloyal."

Will you think like Mr. J. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

10. "What is the point of giving a good education to boys from poor families?" asked Mr. J., "It will only make them want things they can't ever hope to get."

Would you give your support to Mr. J.? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

11. "There are millions of other people who will vote in this election," said Mr. K., "so it does not matter whether I vote, or not."

Will you think like Mr. K. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

12. "It is not my fault if people are unemployed," said Mr. L. "so why should I pay taxes to help them?"

Will you think like Mr. L. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

13. "Most politicians are selfish," said Mrs. M. "they only do things for themselves or their families."

Will you think like Mrs. M. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

14. "The only way to get peace in the world is by supporting the United Nations," said Miss N., "even if it means that we must give up some of our own independence."

Will you think like Miss N. when you grow up? Yes _____

(Tick one) No _____

Can't decide _____

---

15. "If I had my way, we would all pay less tax," said Mr. O., "after all, the government only gives it away to the sick and the old and the unemployed who are no use to us anyway."

Will you think like Mr. O. when you grow up? (Tick one)

Yes _____

No _____

Can't decide _____

On some groups, a factor analysis was carried out of all items put together (those referring to local, and those referring to national government); this produced either two very clear factors containing the local and the national government items, respectively, or a single factor discriminating on local vs. national government items. This, and an examination of difference profiles within and between countries, suggests that the instrument will give useful results in the main study.